

FIRST EDITION

THE CRISIS IN FRANCE

The Liberal Cabinet Dissolved.

A Sketch of Mons. Buffet.

A Counterfeiting Export.

Another Nitro-Glycerine Disaster.

Etc., Etc., Etc., Etc., Etc.

FRANCE.

The Ministerial Crisis and its First Fruits—The Liberal Cabinet Broken Up at Last.

The ministerial crisis which has been impending in Paris for some days has at last resulted in the breaking up of M. Ollivier's Cabinet. M. Buffet, Minister of Finance, has thrown up his portfolio, and it is expected that Count Daru, Minister of Foreign Affairs, and the Marquis de Talhouet, Minister of Public Works, will follow his example.

Buffet, the Outgoing Minister of Finance.

Louis Joseph Buffet, who vacates the office of Minister of Finance, was born at Mirecourt, in the Vosges, in the year 1818. Until the revolution of 1848 he was a lawyer, enjoying a lucrative practice in his native place, but was little known in politics. He was, however, quite popular with the people, and the active part he took in the events which culminated in the overthrow of Louis Philippe recommended him to public favor, and he was elected to the Legislative Assembly for the Vosges by 73,761 votes. Although an openly declared enemy to socialism and inclined to favor the Orleans dynasty, being opposed to the revolution of 1848, M. Buffet gave in his adhesion to the republican constitution and supported General Cavaignac for the Presidency. On the election of Louis Napoleon he acquiesced in the decision of the people, and accepted the retirement of M. Bislo, accepted it as a Minister for Commerce and Agriculture. As such and as a representative in the Legislative Assembly his course conformed to the views of the "party of order," but as he refused to adopt the political ideas which held sway at the Palace of the Elysees he retired from the Ministry, with M. Odillon Barrot, on the 31st of October, 1849. Re-elected to the Assembly from the Vosges, he became one of the most conspicuous members in the important sessions that followed. In 1850 he was appointed a member of the committee charged, with M. Baroche, to consider the project for electoral reform. After the crisis of 1851, which preceded the coup d'etat, he re-entered the Parliamentary Cabinet as a representative of the ideas of the majority, but soon after retired with his colleagues because of his inability to support the measures of the President. So highly was he esteemed by Napoleon that, notwithstanding their disagreement, some days following his resignation he was decorated with the Cross of the Legion of Honor.

On the final establishment of the second Empire, M. Buffet withdrew from all participation in public affairs, and lived in retirement until 1869, when he again appeared before the public as a successful candidate for the Corps Legislatif. He was elected as a moderate liberal, but so tempered his opposition to the Emperor that, when the crisis of last December terminated in the overthrow of the irresponsible ministry, he was at once fixed upon by the Emperor and M. Ollivier as a member of the new ministry. But when portfolios were first tendered him and Count Napoleon Daru, as the recognized leaders of the Left Centre, they declined, and it was not until after the lapse of several days, and when the effort of Ollivier to form a ministry was almost on the point of failure, that they finally consented. On January 3, the Journal Officiel announced the completion of the new ministry and the appointment and acceptance of M. Buffet to the Department of Finance. Through all the stormy period which followed, M. Buffet remained in harmony with his colleagues until the announcement of the determination of the Emperor for a plebiscite on the question of liberalizing the Constitution. The Left Centre demanded the inauguration of these reforms without an appeal to the people, but when the question was presented directly to the Corps Legislatif on the 5th of April, the ministerial programme was sustained by a vote of 237 to 43. From that time rumors of M. Buffet's resignation have been rife, and it is now authoritatively announced.

M. Magne, his Probable Successor.

M. Pierre Magne, who was the predecessor of Buffet in the Department of Finance, will doubtless be his successor. He was born at Perignen, December 3, 1806. He is a self-made man, being of what is termed an "obscure" family. In 1831 he was admitted as an avocat, or attorney, and was patronized by Marshal Bugeaud. M. Fould noticed his peculiar ability, and soon afterwards took charge of his political fortunes. He became a member both of the Constituent and Legislative Assemblies, in which bodies he was recognized as a practical man, although not much of a debating speech-maker. He retired to private life in 1838, but was recalled to official position as Under Secretary of State for Finance in 1849. April 10, 1851, he was appointed Minister of Public Works, in which office he was very successful during three or four years. He was an able advocate of railroad extension in France, and during the interim inspected all the main lines already laid down in the empire and in other countries of Europe, adopting and suggesting improvements. From 1854 to 1859 he held the portfolio of Finance. In 1860 he was nominated Minister without a portfolio, retired from the Cabinet in 1863 in consequence of a disagreement with M. Fould, and was named a Privy Councillor in April of the last-named year. In July, 1869, he was again called to the head of the Department of Finance, and held that position until relieved by M. Buffet in January, 1870. For a time it was thought that he would be retained in the Cabinet under the new ministry, but it was found that there were so many factions in the Liberal ranks to conciliate that it would be necessary for him to vacate. If the report that he is to re-enter the ministry should prove true, he will be an accession to M. Ollivier's forces. He is an accom-

plished and experienced financier, having originated and successfully negotiated nearly all the great loans which the Emperor has found necessary to bolster up his throne.

In December, 1853, he was appointed a Senator. In 1851 he was made a commander of the Legion of Honor, subsequently a grand officer, and in 1864 received the grand cross. During his absence from Paris at one period the Empress Eugenie visited him and found him feeding a brood of chickens.

The following letter, which M. Magne addressed to M. Ollivier in January last, will explain the circumstances, in outward appearance at least, under which the former left the ministry, and the spirit in which he will re-enter it.

JANUARY 1, 1870.—Mon cher Monsieur Ollivier: I am greatly touched by your amiable letter, and thank you for it. The foundation of the Liberal Empire is wished for by the country. I have worked to achieve it with conviction and devotion. I am still attached to this city from the fact that it is an arduous work, and the capital point is success. Nothing should be neglected to bring all the influences into play. Now, I have been told that concessions were being made to the members of the Right Centre and Left Centre, and that arrangements might be facilitated, if a larger number of portfolios were to be distributed to new men, and more particularly if the finance portfolio were to be your disposition. Consider well what you will do before anything is definitely settled. Some matters are not so common as they would seem to be. I am sure that common sense would be to leave the field clear. Whether far or near, I shall always be found among you, zealous and most trustful.

FROM FORTRESS MONROE.

The Artillery School Examination—A Searching Ordinal—Results of General Grant's Forenight.

Correspondence Associated Press.

FORTRESS MONROE, April 9.—The annual examination of the lieutenant and non-commissioned officers who have been under instruction during the past year at the Artillery School of the United States Army commenced at Fortress Monroe on the 1st instant, and is now progressing.

The examination is conducted by a board of artillery and ordnance officers, presided over by Major-General Barry, the commandant of the school and of the post of Fortress Monroe.

The examination is very thorough and searching. Each officer is called up to the blackboard in front of West Point fort, and is there required to demonstrate some proposition or problem relating to the subject on which he is being examined. He is closely questioned over the whole range of the subject, and is made not only to state the facts and dicta of the text, but also to give the reasons therefor.

The subjects which are the course of study at the Artillery School are military, constitutional, and international law, military history, military engineering, ordnance and gunnery, and the mechanical practice of the various services of artillery in the United States service.

The examination in this last-named subject consists in each lieutenant being required to drill a gun-detachment with each kind of gun; to perform the various mechanical operations of mounting, dismounting, and transporting to other portions of the fort the guns and their carriages, and to give the names and uses of all the numerous implements, equipments, and separate parts appertaining to them.

That examination is very thorough and may be taken for granted, when it is stated that each officer is about three hours on the stand.

At the close of the examination a parchment certificate, signed by the commandant and by all the officers who have taken part in the examination, is issued to each officer who passes the ordeal of examination successfully. Last year General W. T. Sherman, General of the army, came from Washington to Fortress Monroe for the express purpose of delivering these certificates or diplomas. On that occasion he was accompanied by several of the officers of the school, and of encouragement to the young officers who were then about to graduate.

This year it is expected that both General Sherman and the Secretary of War will show their continued confidence in the school, and its objects by coming to Fortress Monroe for the same purpose.

The Artillery School is the creation of General Grant, who, when Secretary of War, availed himself of the opportunity to supply, by its creation, a want long felt in the artillery arm of the service. The school has now been in existence for two years, and is fully justifying the hopes and expectations which its warmest friends hoped and predicted for it. Its success is due in a great measure to the personal efforts of the commandant, General Barry, who is one of the most accomplished artillery officers in the service, a strict disciplinarian, and who gives the matter his undivided attention.

The academic year closes on the first of May, and the officers are then bound to undergo instruction, and who pass their examinations successfully, are sent to their respective regiments. A new detail of officers from each of the five regiments of artillery are then ordered to report to General Barry at Fortress Monroe for the next year's course of instruction.

There can be no question of the fact that the artillery of the army, and the whole army itself, is greatly benefited by the work and results of the Artillery School.

Burning of the Steamer Kennebec.

The steamer N. P. Barre, of New York and New York, arrived here at 4 P. M. to-day, and reports the burning of the steamer Kennebec at Gloucester Point wharf this morning. From Captain McCarrie and Mr. Trower, the mate, we learn the following particulars:—The Kennebec was from Baltimore bound to West Point, York river, with a cargo of freight and passengers. She arrived at Gloucester Point about daylight, and while the crew were discharging some freight, a fire was discovered proceeding from the vicinity of the boiler. All hands were at once called to extinguish it, but so rapidly did the flames spread that it was with difficulty the passengers could be saved.

Foreign Items.

A new idea in connection with "dust and disease" has been broached in a recent lecture by Mr. Bloxam, the lecturer on chemistry to the English Department of Artillery Studies. His suggestion is that the various explosives, abandoning gun-cotton, should collect the germs of small-pox, and other malignant diseases, on cotton or other dust-collecting substances, and load shells with them. We should then hear of an enemy bludgeoned from his position by a volley of typhus, or a few rounds of Asiatic cholera.

NITRO-GLYCERINE AGAIN.

Two Men Killed at Shipyard's Works at Ridsdale.

Another fatal explosion of nitro-glycerine occurred on Friday afternoon, on the Haekensack meadows, at the ruins of the glycerine works of T. P. Shaffner. A few weeks ago an explosion in this place destroyed the works of four persons, and reduced the factory to ruins. Thousands of pounds of the explosive substance were consumed at the time, but there remained in one quarter of the yard in which the factory stood a quantity that remained unexploded. The work of removing the debris and clearing the ground was commenced a few days ago, and has given employment to a number of workmen. Yesterday afternoon two of these men, father and son, were removing a lot of the glycerine, when it exploded, killing them instantly. Their bodies were thrown to a great distance from the spot where they were standing, were horribly mangled. They were removed by the other workmen to an adjacent house, and Justice Miller, of Englewood, was notified to view the bodies and hold an inquest. This last

said illustration of the dangers attending the use of nitro-glycerine has aroused the people to a realization of the peril to which they are placed by the existence of the factory in the community, and it is probable that the rebuilding of the works, which was said to have been contemplated by the proprietors, will not be effected.

STRANGE—IF TRUE.

The Sea Serpent Outdone—A Hideous Monster.

The Savannah Advertiser of a recent date publishes the following startling narrative:—A party fishing to this city from South Carolina, through Wright river, in a small sailboat, manned by three negro oarsmen, has furnished us with a decidedly sensational account of his adventures with one of the most unheard of creatures that ever crawled or floated under the firmament of heaven, and assured us positively that he has not been deceived by any freak of fancy or undue excitement of mind. Our informant, on the morning of the 28th, towards noon, as he tells us, when about half a mile from Wright river, in the morning, the Savannah, two miles above Fort Pulaski, with his negro men pulling quietly along near the shore, the slight-built craft was suddenly and without any premonitory sign lifted up, as by some immense roller, throwing the crew out of their seats, and sending the life out of them. The shock was so sudden that danger existed for a second of the boat turning over, but luckily it righted again and sank back into the water, which foamed like breakers.

"But," says the hero of the adventure, "I did not heed the danger, for I was so excited by the nor the grovelling fear of the men with me, for I could not, if life was at stake, have taken my eyes away from the hideous creature that had caused all the commotion, and was making its way inland out of the river into the long rushes on the bank."

"Never before had I anticipated such a monster, nor do I ever wish to see another. A creature almost indescribable, though its general appearance is fixed in my mind's eye too indelibly for pleasant recollection. The beast, fish or reptile, whatever species of God's creation it might be, was of a tawny greenish color, growing more definite towards the head. The body of the creature was seal-shaped, apparently twenty feet long and as thick as a carcase of the largest sea elephant. From this trunk sprang forth the most remarkable feature of the phenomenon, a long, curved, swan-like neck, large enough apparently to have taken a man in whole, terminated by a head scarcely similar to that of an immense fish, but with a more grotesque and ferocious ferocity in their expression to make a man tremble. The back of the beast was deeply ridged, the ridges running from the base of the neck to the extreme end of the tail, and shaped something like an alligator's, but much longer, so it seemed, than the body completed the tout ensemble of this wonderful anomaly. The creature navigated by feet, resembling the fore feet of an alligator, and its progress was so slow that it was almost impossible to tell the name of the creature, or the combination of the terrible before me," says our friend, "it was not strange that I trembled, but before the frightened man had time to act, or I time to advise, the cause of our terror drew itself across the little boat, and out of sight, into the water beyond."

The above statement we have from the lips of the gentleman himself, and, being duly vouched for, we have every reason to believe in its truth.

MYSTERIES OF COUNTERFEITING.

Testimony of an Expert Now Serving a Sentence in the Indiana Penitentiary.

The Detroit Post has the following:—One John B. Trout, who is now serving a sentence in the Indiana Penitentiary, at Michigan City, was brought here to testify in a case against a man who was in the counterfeiting business in Indiana from 1865 until 1867, at which latter date Trout was sent to prison.

For the benefit of the Court, counsel, jury, and spectators, the following is a translation of the process of engraving plates and printing notes, describing the various articles which had been seized in the Johnson house, and their various uses in counterfeiting. But the most wonderful exhibition of his skill was in telling the name of the engraver, or the name of the man who had engraved the plates, by examination of a bill printed from it. He was thoroughly familiar with the work of all the engravers. He detected a counterfeit from a genuine bill at a glance. He readily designated as counterfeit an issue which even the Treasury Department had taken for genuine. Trout could not describe the process by which he distinguished these various bills, but characterized it as an indescribable instinct. He said he had worked of hundreds of thousands of dollars in counterfeit money, and was engaged in the business. He is apparently about thirty years of age, and seems to be on the brink of a consumptive's grave. His term of sentence does not expire for two years yet. But he says he does not expect a pardon, though so near death. He prefers to end his days in prison, and has much to say with his own hands. He is a modest, quiet-looking man, and says his appearance always won him the confidence of those with whom he came in contact, and had much to do with his success in disposing of counterfeit money. It seems surprising that a man of his talent should choose to use it in a course of crime and end his life in a state prison. His skill, exercised in a legitimate direction, would doubtless have gained him a competency.

FROM WASHINGTON.

Important Naval Order.

WASHINGTON, April 11.—The following important order has been issued by the Navy Department in the case of a court-martial where unlawful punishments were executed:—

First. At a naval general court-martial held on board the United States steamship Portsmouth, in the Bay of Rio Janeiro, January 13, 1870, by order of Rear Admiral Joseph S. Meade, United States Navy, commanding South Atlantic fleet, of which court Captain Stephen D. Treachard, United States Navy, was president, was arraigned and tried Joseph King, ordinary seaman, United States Navy, on the following charges and specifications:—

Charge first. Violation of article 7, section 4, articles for the better government of the navy. Specification first. In this, that the said Joseph King, ordinary seaman, and serving as such on board the United States steamship Portsmouth, third rate, on or about the 7th day of May, one thousand eight hundred and sixty-nine, at anchor in the bay of Rio de Janeiro, Brazil, being ordered by his superior officer, Lieutenant John Schouler, who at the time was officer of the deck of the said ship, to take up the ropes and stow the cabin wind-sail, did use disrespectful language to the said Lieutenant John Schouler, saying, "I'm not going to take seven days on the black list for a dirty drunken —" like Mr. Robertson, the executive officer of the said ship, and the said Lieutenant Schouler, placed under the charge of a sentry by the master-at-arms of the said Joseph King, ordinary seaman, did say, "There is not an officer on the ship who is not a — beach-comber," or words to that effect.

Specification second. In this, that the said Joseph King, ordinary seaman, and serving as such on board the United States ship Portsmouth, third rate, on or about the eighth day of May, one thousand eight hundred and sixty-nine, at anchor in the bay of Rio de Janeiro, did say to his commanding officer, Commander A. A. Semmes, in the presence of the officers and crew of said vessel, who were assembled on the quarter-deck to hear the sentence of a summary court-martial in his presence, "Hell will be my portion, and old Robertson get there," and a few minutes afterwards, in presence of Lieutenant-Commanders J. C. Robertson and H. H. Goring, did use the following language to his commanding officer, Commander A. A. Semmes:—"You old Robertson, you are a —"

And shortly time after the foregoing occurrence, while his commanding officer, Commander A. A. Semmes, was passing the launch in which Joseph King, ordinary seaman, was confined, he, Joseph King, ordinary seaman, did bid Commander A. A. Semmes with the words, "You old —"

Charge two. Violation of article 7, section 10, articles for the better government of the navy. Specification. In this, that the said Joseph King, ordinary seaman, and serving as such on board the United States steamship Portsmouth, third rate, on or about the 7th day of December, 1869, said vessel being then at anchor in the Bay of Rio de Janeiro, did, in company with others, attempt to desert in the dingy of the said United States ship Portsmouth, and did not desert therefrom until brought to by a shot from a carbine striking one of the oars of the boat.

Charge third. Violation of article 3, section 2, articles for the better government of the navy. Specification. In this, that the said Joseph King, ordinary seaman, and serving as such on board the United States steamship Portsmouth, third rate, on or about the 7th day of December, 1869, said vessel being then at anchor in the Bay of Rio de Janeiro, did, in the act of deserting, use profane and blasphemous language, and otherwise threaten Lieutenant J. E. Craig and Ensign C. P. Shaw, his superior officers, who made the arrest, challenging Lieutenant J. E. Craig to personal combat. To the first specification of the first charge the accused pleaded in bar of trial to the first specification of the first charge that immediately after the date of said specification, viz, 7th of May, 1869, he was tried by a summary court-martial and sentenced to confinement in double-irons, on the said ship Portsmouth, for three months, and extra police duties for three months, and that this sentence having been carried into effect he was fully restored to duty, nor was he informed that charges were pending against him, and he therefore became delinquent in his duty, and in violation of the regulations, article 32, section 1. The Court sustained this plea, and dismissed the said specification. They did this upon evidence produced in a court session when the Court was closed for deliberation, and in the absence of the accused. That evidence should have been produced only in open court, by the accused, as part of his case and in support of his plea. This, while the conclusion arrived at upon the proof, is not approved and is approved by the Secretary of the Navy, the mode of introducing that proof was wholly irregular and is disapproved.

To the second specification of the first charge the accused pleaded in bar of trial to the second specification of the first charge that immediately after the date of said specification, viz, 7th of May, 1869, he was tried by a summary court-martial and sentenced to confinement in double-irons, on the said ship Portsmouth, for three months, and extra police duties for three months, and that this sentence having been carried into effect he was fully restored to duty, nor was he informed that charges were pending against him, and he therefore became delinquent in his duty, and in violation of the regulations, article 32, section 1. The Court sustained this plea, and dismissed the said specification. They did this upon evidence produced in a court session when the Court was closed for deliberation, and in the absence of the accused. That evidence should have been produced only in open court, by the accused, as part of his case and in support of his plea. This, while the conclusion arrived at upon the proof, is not approved and is approved by the Secretary of the Navy, the mode of introducing that proof was wholly irregular and is disapproved.

To the second specification of the first charge the accused pleaded in bar of trial to the second specification of the first charge that immediately after the date of said specification, viz, 7th of May, 1869, he was tried by a summary court-martial and sentenced to confinement in double-irons, on the said ship Portsmouth, for three months, and extra police duties for three months, and that this sentence having been carried into effect he was fully restored to duty, nor was he informed that charges were pending against him, and he therefore became delinquent in his duty, and in violation of the regulations, article 32, section 1. The Court sustained this plea, and dismissed the said specification. They did this upon evidence produced in a court session when the Court was closed for deliberation, and in the absence of the accused. That evidence should have been produced only in open court, by the accused, as part of his case and in support of his plea. This, while the conclusion arrived at upon the proof, is not approved and is approved by the Secretary of the Navy, the mode of introducing that proof was wholly irregular and is disapproved.

To the second specification of the first charge the accused pleaded in bar of trial to the second specification of the first charge that immediately after the date of said specification, viz, 7th of May, 1869, he was tried by a summary court-martial and sentenced to confinement in double-irons, on the said ship Portsmouth, for three months, and extra police duties for three months, and that this sentence having been carried into effect he was fully restored to duty, nor was he informed that charges were pending against him, and he therefore became delinquent in his duty, and in violation of the regulations, article 32, section 1. The Court sustained this plea, and dismissed the said specification. They did this upon evidence produced in a court session when the Court was closed for deliberation, and in the absence of the accused. That evidence should have been produced only in open court, by the accused, as part of his case and in support of his plea. This, while the conclusion arrived at upon the proof, is not approved and is approved by the Secretary of the Navy, the mode of introducing that proof was wholly irregular and is disapproved.

To the second specification of the first charge the accused pleaded in bar of trial to the second specification of the first charge that immediately after the date of said specification, viz, 7th of May, 1869, he was tried by a summary court-martial and sentenced to confinement in double-irons, on the said ship Portsmouth, for three months, and extra police duties for three months, and that this sentence having been carried into effect he was fully restored to duty, nor was he informed that charges were pending against him, and he therefore became delinquent in his duty, and in violation of the regulations, article 32, section 1. The Court sustained this plea, and dismissed the said specification. They did this upon evidence produced in a court session when the Court was closed for deliberation, and in the absence of the accused. That evidence should have been produced only in open court, by the accused, as part of his case and in support of his plea. This, while the conclusion arrived at upon the proof, is not approved and is approved by the Secretary of the Navy, the mode of introducing that proof was wholly irregular and is disapproved.

To the second specification of the first charge the accused pleaded in bar of trial to the second specification of the first charge that immediately after the date of said specification, viz, 7th of May, 1869, he was tried by a summary court-martial and sentenced to confinement in double-irons, on the said ship Portsmouth, for three months, and extra police duties for three months, and that this sentence having been carried into effect he was fully restored to duty, nor was he informed that charges were pending against him, and he therefore became delinquent in his duty, and in violation of the regulations, article 32, section 1. The Court sustained this plea, and dismissed the said specification. They did this upon evidence produced in a court session when the Court was closed for deliberation, and in the absence of the accused. That evidence should have been produced only in open court, by the accused, as part of his case and in support of his plea. This, while the conclusion arrived at upon the proof, is not approved and is approved by the Secretary of the Navy, the mode of introducing that proof was wholly irregular and is disapproved.

To the second specification of the first charge the accused pleaded in bar of trial to the second specification of the first charge that immediately after the date of said specification, viz, 7th of May, 1869, he was tried by a summary court-martial and sentenced to confinement in double-irons, on the said ship Portsmouth, for three months, and extra police duties for three months, and that this sentence having been carried into effect he was fully restored to duty, nor was he informed that charges were pending against him, and he therefore became delinquent in his duty, and in violation of the regulations, article 32, section 1. The Court sustained this plea, and dismissed the said specification. They did this upon evidence produced in a court session when the Court was closed for deliberation, and in the absence of the accused. That evidence should have been produced only in open court, by the accused, as part of his case and in support of his plea. This, while the conclusion arrived at upon the proof, is not approved and is approved by the Secretary of the Navy, the mode of introducing that proof was wholly irregular and is disapproved.

To the second specification of the first charge the accused pleaded in bar of trial to the second specification of the first charge that immediately after the date of said specification, viz, 7th of May, 1869, he was tried by a summary court-martial and sentenced to confinement in double-irons, on the said ship Portsmouth, for three months, and extra police duties for three months, and that this sentence having been carried into effect he was fully restored to duty, nor was he informed that charges were pending against him, and he therefore became delinquent in his duty, and in violation of the regulations, article 32, section 1. The Court sustained this plea, and dismissed the said specification. They did this upon evidence produced in a court session when the Court was closed for deliberation, and in the absence of the accused. That evidence should have been produced only in open court, by the accused, as part of his case and in support of his plea. This, while the conclusion arrived at upon the proof, is not approved and is approved by the Secretary of the Navy, the mode of introducing that proof was wholly irregular and is disapproved.

To the second specification of the first charge the accused pleaded in bar of trial to the second specification of the first charge that immediately after the date of said specification, viz, 7th of May, 1869, he was tried by a summary court-martial and sentenced to confinement in double-irons, on the said ship Portsmouth, for three months, and extra police duties for three months, and that this sentence having been carried into effect he was fully restored to duty, nor was he informed that charges were pending against him, and he therefore became delinquent in his duty, and in violation of the regulations, article 32, section 1. The Court sustained this plea, and dismissed the said specification. They did this upon evidence produced in a court session when the Court was closed for deliberation, and in the absence of the accused. That evidence should have been produced only in open court, by the accused, as part of his case and in support of his plea. This, while the conclusion arrived at upon the proof, is not approved and is approved by the Secretary of the Navy, the mode of introducing that proof was wholly irregular and is disapproved.

To the second specification of the first charge the accused pleaded in bar of trial to the second specification of the first charge that immediately after the date of said specification, viz, 7th of May, 1869, he was tried by a summary court-martial and sentenced to confinement in double-irons, on the said ship Portsmouth, for three months, and extra police duties for three months, and that this sentence having been carried into effect he was fully restored to duty, nor was he informed that charges were pending against him, and he therefore became delinquent in his duty, and in violation of the regulations, article 32, section 1. The Court sustained this plea, and dismissed the said specification. They did this upon evidence produced in a court session when the Court was closed for deliberation, and in the absence of the accused. That evidence should have been produced only in open court, by the accused, as part of his case and in support of his plea. This, while the conclusion arrived at upon the proof, is not approved and is approved by the Secretary of the Navy, the mode of introducing that proof was wholly irregular and is disapproved.

SECOND EDITION

LATEST BY TELEGRAPH.

Unlawful Naval Punishments.

Order of Secretary Robeson.

Our Fleet in the West Indies.

FROM WASHINGTON.

Important Naval Order.

WASHINGTON, April 11.—The following important order has been issued by the Navy Department in the case of a court-martial where unlawful punishments were executed:—

First. At a naval general court-martial held on board the United States steamship Portsmouth, in the Bay of Rio Janeiro, January 13, 1870, by order of Rear Admiral Joseph S. Meade, United States Navy, commanding South Atlantic fleet, of which court Captain Stephen D. Treachard, United States Navy, was president, was arraigned and tried Joseph King, ordinary seaman, United States Navy, on the following charges and specifications:—

Charge first. Violation of article 7, section 4, articles for the better government of the navy. Specification first. In this, that the said Joseph King, ordinary seaman, and serving as such on board the United States steamship Portsmouth, third rate, on or about the 7th day of May, one thousand eight hundred and sixty-nine, at anchor in the bay of Rio de Janeiro, Brazil, being ordered by his superior officer, Lieutenant John Schouler, who at the time was officer of the deck of the said ship, to take up the ropes and stow the cabin wind-sail, did use disrespectful language to the said Lieutenant John Schouler, saying, "I'm not going to take seven days on the black list for a dirty drunken —" like Mr. Robertson, the executive officer of the said ship, and the said Lieutenant Schouler, placed under the charge of a sentry by the master-at-arms of the said Joseph King, ordinary seaman, did say, "There is not an officer on the ship who is not a — beach-comber," or words to that effect.

Specification second. In this, that the said Joseph King, ordinary seaman, and serving as such on board the United States ship Portsmouth, third rate, on or about the eighth day of May, one thousand eight hundred and sixty-nine, at anchor in the bay of Rio de Janeiro, did say to his commanding officer, Commander A. A. Semmes, in the presence of the officers and crew of said vessel, who were assembled on the quarter-deck to hear the sentence of a summary court-martial in his presence, "Hell will be my portion, and old Robertson get there," and a few minutes afterwards, in presence of Lieutenant-Commanders J. C. Robertson and H. H. Goring, did use the following language to his commanding officer, Commander A. A. Semmes:—"You old Robertson, you are a —"

And shortly time after the foregoing occurrence, while his commanding officer, Commander A. A. Semmes, was passing the launch in which Joseph King, ordinary seaman, was confined, he, Joseph King, ordinary seaman, did bid Commander A. A. Semmes with the words, "You old —"

Charge two. Violation of article 7, section 10, articles for the better government of the navy. Specification. In this, that the said Joseph King, ordinary seaman, and serving as such on board the United States steamship Portsmouth, third rate, on or about the 7th day of December, 1869, said vessel being then at anchor in the Bay of Rio de Janeiro, did, in company with others, attempt to desert in the dingy of the said United States ship Portsmouth, and did not desert therefrom until brought to by a shot from a carbine striking one of the oars of the boat.

Charge third. Violation of article 3, section 2, articles for the better government of the navy. Specification. In this, that the said Joseph King, ordinary seaman, and serving as such on board the United States steamship Portsmouth, third rate, on or about the 7th day of December, 1869, said vessel being then at anchor in the Bay of Rio de Janeiro, did, in the act of deserting, use profane and blasphemous language, and otherwise threaten Lieutenant J. E. Craig and Ensign C. P. Shaw, his superior officers, who made the arrest, challenging Lieutenant J. E. Craig to personal combat. To the first specification of the first charge the accused pleaded in bar of trial to the first specification of the first charge that immediately after the date of said specification, viz, 7th of May, 1869, he was tried by a summary court-martial and sentenced to confinement in double-irons, on the said ship Portsmouth, for three months, and extra police duties for three months, and that this sentence having been carried into effect he was fully restored to duty, nor was he informed that charges were pending against him, and he therefore became delinquent in his duty, and in violation of the regulations, article 32, section 1. The Court sustained this plea, and dismissed the said specification. They did this upon evidence produced in a court session when the Court was closed for deliberation, and in the absence of the accused. That evidence should have been produced only in open court, by the accused, as part of his case and in support of his plea. This, while the conclusion arrived at upon the proof, is not approved and is approved by the Secretary of the Navy, the mode of introducing that proof was wholly irregular and is disapproved.

To the second specification of the first charge the accused pleaded in bar of trial to the second specification of the first charge that immediately after the date of said specification, viz, 7th of May, 1869, he was tried by a summary court-martial and sentenced to confinement in double-irons, on the said ship Portsmouth, for three months, and extra police duties for three months, and that this sentence having been carried into effect he was fully restored to duty, nor was he informed that charges were pending against him, and he therefore became delinquent in his duty, and in violation of the regulations, article 32, section 1. The Court sustained this plea, and dismissed the said specification. They did this upon evidence produced in a court session when the Court was closed for deliberation, and in the absence of the accused. That evidence should have been produced only in open court, by the accused, as part of his case and in support of his plea. This, while the conclusion arrived at upon the proof, is not approved and is approved by the Secretary of the Navy, the mode of introducing that proof was wholly irregular and is disapproved.

To the second specification of the first charge the accused pleaded in bar of trial to the second specification of the first charge that immediately after the date of said specification, viz, 7th of May, 1869, he was tried by a summary court-martial and sentenced to confinement in double-irons, on the said ship Portsmouth, for three months, and extra police duties for three months, and that this sentence having been carried into effect he was fully restored to duty, nor was he informed that charges were pending against him, and he therefore became delinquent in his duty, and in violation of the regulations, article 32, section 1. The Court sustained this plea, and dismissed the said specification. They did this upon evidence produced in a court session when the Court was closed for deliberation, and in the absence of the accused. That evidence should have been produced only in open court, by the accused, as part of his case and in support of his plea. This, while the conclusion arrived at upon the proof, is not approved and is approved by the Secretary of the Navy, the mode of introducing that proof was wholly irregular and is disapproved.

To the second specification of the first charge the accused pleaded in bar of trial to the second specification of the first charge that immediately after the date of said specification, viz, 7th of May, 1869, he was tried by a summary court-martial and sentenced to confinement in double-irons, on the said ship Portsmouth, for three months, and extra police duties for three months, and that this sentence having been carried into effect he was fully restored to duty, nor was he informed that charges were pending against him, and he therefore became delinquent in his duty, and in violation of the regulations, article 32, section 1. The Court sustained this plea, and dismissed the said specification. They did this upon evidence produced in a court session when the Court was closed for deliberation, and in the absence of the accused. That evidence should have been produced only in open court, by the accused, as part of his case and in support of his plea. This, while the conclusion arrived at upon the proof, is not approved and is approved by the Secretary of the Navy, the mode of introducing that proof was wholly irregular and is disapproved.

To the second specification of the first charge the accused pleaded in bar of trial to the second specification of the first charge that